DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 362 08 CE 013 040

AUTHOR Hoyt, Kenneth B.
TITLE Refining the Career Education Concept: Part II. Monographs on Career Education.
INSTITUTION Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 37p.; For a related document see ED 132 427
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 017-080-01739-3)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; *Community Colleges; Community Role; *Employment; *Job Training; Manpower Development; *Policy Formation; *Program Development; Public Policy; Skill Development; Social Values; Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Four concept papers prepared by the director of the Office of Career Education, U.S. Office of Education, during 1976-77 are presented in this monograph. "Career Education and Manpower Training" presents a treatment of jobs versus work, specific vocational skills versus adaptability skills, paid employment versus productive use of leisure time, community authority versus community responsibility, and adjusting to society versus adjusting society. The second paper, "Basic Issues in Implementation of Career Education," deals with implementation issues in infusion and in collaboration. "The Human Side of Work," presents a study of the meaning of "work"--what it is, what it is not, and the difficulties encountered with the definition of "work." The fourth paper, "Career Education in the Community College: An Evolving Concept," deals with the role of community colleges in career education, and the basic elements of career education in community college settings. (BL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED146362

MONOGRAPHS ON CAREER EDUCATION

REFINING THE CAREER EDUCATION CONCEPT

PART II

by
Kenneth B. Hoyt, Director
Office of Career Education
Office of Education

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Joseph A. Califano, Jr., *Secretary*
Mary F. Berry, *Assistant Secretary for Education*

OFFICE OF EDUCATION
Ernest L. Boyer, Commissioner

OE 013 040

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1977

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402
Stock Number 017-080-01739-3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Career Education and Manpower Training 1

Basic Issues in Implementation of Career Education 6

The Human Side of Work 15

Career Education in the Community College:
An Evolving Concept 24

References 32

REFINING THE CAREER EDUCATION CONCEPT: PART II

Preface

In 1976, the Office of Career Education published a monograph entitled *Refining the Career Education Concept.* That monograph contained six concept papers prepared within OCE during the period 1974-76. During the 1976-77 academic year, four additional papers, each of which make some small contribution to the evolving career education concept, have been prepared. It is those four papers that form the contents of this monograph.

The reader will immediately notice that two of these papers are concerned with conceptual problems related to settings other than the K-12 level of education. During the last year, it has been increasingly obvious that the career education effort must be extended beyond the K-12 setting. Two very important settings—one in the manpower field and the other in the community college setting—are represented among the four articles found in this monograph.

The remaining two articles in this monograph are both directly conceptual in nature. In "The Human Side of Work," I have tried to explain why, to me, the word "work" must continue to represent the bedrock word for the career education concept. Near the end of that article, I tried to acknowledge some of the continuing problems associated with use of this word. I am quite willing to admit the existence of these problems and the fact that they are due, in large part, to the fact that I have still not been able to develop a really good definition of the word "work."

The second conceptual article deals, in its last section, with the concept of "collaboration" in career education. This surely must be one of the next big "frontiers" to conquer in the continuing attempts to refine the career education concept. The question of "How will the community relate with the schools?" is not at all the same as the question of "How will the schools relate to the community?" Yet, both of these questions must be resolved before we arrive at an operational understanding of the word "collaboration." This article represents a beginning attempt at raising some of the hard questions that must be answered if progress is to be made here.

It is hoped that this monograph can be viewed as representing one small segment in time of what must necessarily be a *continuing* effort. The career education concept *is* moving toward maturity. It still has a long way to go.

Kenneth B. Hoyt, Director
Office of Career Education
U.S. Office of Education

CAREER EDUCATION AND MANPOWER TRAINING

Our nation invested $14.439 billion in various kinds of manpower programs between 1964 and 1974. After reviewing the available evidence gathered from a variety of evaluation studies, Sar Levitan, in a 1976 book entitled *The Promise of Greatness*, concluded:

> Extensive measurement and evaluation of the effectiveness of manpower training has not yielded any conclusive answers, but this is more reflection on the state of the art of measurement and evaluation than on the performance of manpower training. The evidence of success is extensive even if subject to reservations. . . . The admission evidence is positive and is more substantial than for most other governmental endeavors. A verdit of failure is, therefore, untenable. (pp. 142-143)

I do not want to argue with Levitan's conclusions. At the same time, I feel it important to point out that, during this same period, we have witnessed no significant reductions in: (a) the high school dropout rate; (b) the ratio of youth to adult unemployment; (c) the ratio of unemployment among non-white, as opposed to white youth, or (d) the ratio of unemployment among female as opposed to male youth; Further, if anything, we have witnessed, in the occupational society, an increase in a variety of indicators of work alienation. If manpower programs have been necessary and helpful, they have certainly not been sufficient. The stability of some of these statistics makes this clear. Much more remains to be done.

It is my contention that the effectiveness of manpower efforts can and will be increased if a set of long-run goals is added to the short-run goals that have, over the last 14 years, dictated many manpower program operations. I would further contend that infusion of the career education concept into manpower program operations would represent a positive move in this direction. I hope here to convince you that these contentions may have some validity. To do so, I have tried to organize these remarks around five aspects of career education which I believe hold positive potential for change in manpower program operations.

I am well aware of the fact that some manpower programs have already made significant moves to incorporate the career education concept. For such programs, I hope these remarks are rewarding. For others, I hope they are challenging.

Jobs Versus Work

Both social and political pressures have forced many manpower programs to place a high priority on helping trainees find jobs when they leave the training center. I would not like to see this effort diminished. I would, however, like very

much to see it supplemented with an equally great effort on helping trainees discover work in addition to finding jobs. Manpower programs should benefit individuals throughout their lives, not just in the first year or two following training.

In today's society, each individual is faced with answering the very personal question "Why should I choose to work?" To ignore this question by concentrating on the more immediate question of "How can I find a job?" restricts the freedom and detracts from the personal worth of the individual being served. The pressures that come from society, and often from trainees themselves, for an "immediate payoff" approach should not detract manpower officials from expressing concerns and implementing actions aimed at helping trainees answer *both* of these questions.

The need to work is a basic human need of all human beings. It is the need to achieve - to do - to know that one is important because she/he has done - to know that someone is needed for something. Former President Lyndon Johnson put it well when he said "To hunger for use and to go unused is the greatest hunger of all." If this need can be met through one's paid job, that job becomes important and meaningful to the individual - a way of helping that individual see and recognize his/her own worth. If it cannot, the individual may find only "labor" - that is, a set of involuntary, meaningless, requirements - in the paid job with the only tangible benefits from that job being financial rewards.

Those who can discover a personal meaningfulness of work in their paid jobs are far more likely to be successful than those who find only labor. For this to occur, manpower trainees need time to understand themselves in relationship to the multiple kinds of work values that exist in today's society. If we fail to help trainees do so under an assumption that economic pressures are sufficient rewards for the individual, we have restricted the individual's freedom and denied her/his basic worth. Low-income persons are trapped into an undue worship of only economic work values. To leave them in that trap is to doom many to a life of labor, not a life of work. It is not right and it is not fair. Self-understanding, career exploration, and career decision making should be as important in manpower programs as are job placement efforts.

Specific Vocational Skills Versus Adaptability Skills

From the beginning, manpower programs have faced heavy pressure to equip trainees with specific vocational skills that will enable them to gain entry into today's labor market. The need for such skills has, operationally, restricted the freedom of training choices available to the individual. The rationale for this emphasis is simple and direct - namely, unless the individual can gain entry to the world of paid employment, there is no way to move up in that world. That logic is clear and undebatable. At the same time, it is equally clear that the occupational society continues to undergo rapid change - that equipping a trainee with an entry job skill today is no assurance that those skills will be in demand five or ten years from now. That is why career education has contended

that adaptability skills - the skills required to change with change - are equally as important as are job specific skills. It would be nice if all existing manpower programs placed equal emphasis on helping trainees acquire both kinds of skills.

The adaptability skills involved here include: (a) basic academic skills; (b) good work habits; (c) a personally meaningful set of work values; (d) career decision-making skills; (e) job seeking skills; (f) job getting skills; and (g) skills required to make the transition from work to school as well as from school to work. I know of almost no manpower programs currently operating that ignore the topic of adaptability skills altogether. At the same time, I know few which have placed the acquisition of such skills on a priority equal to that given to acquisition of specific vocational skills. It seems to me it is past time that this be done.

Paid Employment Versus Productive Use of Leisure Time

Manpower programs were established, and continue to operate, with a clear mandate to prepare people for and help them gain entry into the world of paid employment. It is not only unlikely, and would also be undesirable, to abandon this primary goal. Still, a number of factors argue for an insertion of emphasis on unpaid work, carried out as productive use of leisure time, as part of the operational efforts of manpower programs.

First, a wealth of evidence exists demonstrating that one's leisure time activities influence one's productivity in the world of paid employment. It makes little sense for any employer to contend that it makes no difference what his/her employees do in their leisure time. Employer concerns in such matters are clearly evident in other countries - with Japan being perhaps the most obvious example. If manpower programs are committed to giving the disadvantaged every possible opportunity to succeed in the world of paid employment, it stands to reason that part of the total manpower training effort be directed toward productive use of leisure time.

Second, and equally important, there is no way that *all* person, despite all that may be done in the arenas of work values and humanization of the work place, will find great personal meaning and meaningfulness in their job tasks in the occupational society. One reason some people don't like their jobs is that they, in fact, have awful jobs - jobs that are dull, repetitive, and lacking in challenge or in meaningfulness. The human need of such individuals to find a personal meaningfulness through work, as part of their total lifestyle, is still present. Where that need cannot be met in the world of paid employment, it should certainly be met through productive use of leisure time. People with nothing to do will very seldom do nothing. The individualistic goals of manpower programs could very well be better met if an emphasis on productive use of leisure time were added to the emphasis on preparation for productivity in the world of paid employment.

Community Authority Versus Community Responsibility

Recent changes in manpower policies have resulted in a great increase in authority for operations being centered at the community level. For years, the OIC has been a leader in community involvement in manpower program operations. Still, even the most ambitious efforts have left much undone. For the community to *cooperate* with manpower programs is not the same as community *collaboration*. The difference between "cooperation" and "collaboration" is, in a very real sense, the difference between having responsibility centered on the manpower program itself as opposed to having its success being a total community responsibility. If manpower program officials are to listen to advice from community leaders, then community leaders should also listen to advice from manpower officials. If students in manpower programs are to listen to employers, then employers, in turn, should be willing to listen to and learn from manpower trainees. If the community is to serve manpower programs, then manpower programs should also serve the community. As an example, I would see great merit in efforts that call for manpower trainees to work with local school personnel, at the K-12 level, in helping elementary and secondary school pupils in career awareness and exploration. By the same token, why should not the business-labor-industry community serve as a career exploration and work experience facility for manpower trainees? A second example lies in the tremendous potential for utilizing existing community resources in furthering the effectiveness of manpower operations. We can see, of course, many communities where local churches have worked with manpower programs. We see very few where other community resources - including the local Chamber of Commerce, American Legion, Business and Professional Women's Club, and Rotary International have been involved in a collaborative relationship with existing manpower programs. We are trying to engage these kinds of groups - and more - in community collaborative career education efforts at the K-12 level. I fail to see why they should not also be involved in career education efforts existing as parts of manpower programs.

Adjusting to Society Versus Adjusting Society

Manpower programs have, for many years, devoted considerable effort to helping trainees become aware of the value systems and expectations of employers. Trainees have been well schooled in how to "play the game" in ways that will make them acceptable to employers. It is an important part of the manpower effort and one that, for a host of very practical reasons, cannot be eliminated. However, to stop here leaves the trainee in a position of having to make a number of kinds of adjustments to a society which itself is in need of adjustment. I am speaking here very specifically about problems concerned with both racism and sexism as deterrents to full freedom of educational and occupational opportunity - including opportunities for advancement in the system. It would seem to me both proper and important for manpower trainees

to learn ways of contributing, in a positive and effective manner, to solutions of these very serious societal problems. Other problems related to the so-called "generation gap" could, of course, also be included, but problems of racism and of sexism are particularly serious. It seems to me that an emphasis on how to effect positive societal changes in these matters would be a most appropriate part of a manpower training program. It would certainly be consistent with a career education emphasis.

To incorporate these five aspects of career education into a total manpower training program would not call for a great increase in dollars. That is, large increases in buildings, equipment, and staff salaries - the biggest items in any educational budget - are unnecessary. Current buildings, equipment, and staff can be utilized very easily for the most part. Nevertheless, while a large increase in dollars is not required, a significant increase in *effort* will be necessary. The largest increased cost will be in time required for trainees to benefit from the five kinds of additional emphasis suggested here. Even here, the relative cost will be small in that the largest amount of time will still be spent for acquiring specific vocational skill training. Many of these additional kinds of learning can and should be infused into existing classroom instruction. In the end, the amount of additional time will be relatively small.

It seems to be most appropriate that the theme for this conference should be stated as "SKILLS, JOBS, HOPE FOR AMERICA." As I look at the history of manpower programs, it seems that we have done better in providing *skills* than in providing *jobs* - and better in providing jobs than in providing *hope*. Career education seeks to provide hope to individuals through recognizing and acting on the basic importance of work in the lifestyle of all individuals. It is a powerful concept and one that I believe manpower programs could use effectively. I hope these remarks may stimulate some to do so.

BASIC ISSUES IN IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION

The "day of reckoning" for career education is fast approaching. It will be represented by that point in time when our primary efforts move from concentration on philosophical conceptualization to operational implementation. Like any other movement, career education will—and should—be judged more by its deeds than by its words. Good intentions are a poor substitute for effective actions.

While our philosophical efforts may lead to beautiful mosaics, our implementation efforts are much more likely to appear as jagged bits and pieces. When the "bits and pieces" are put together, the mosaic they form is often quite different from our philosophical ideal. The concept of "instant implementation" is a day dream that cannot be converted into an operational reality. Our critics will pay much more attention to our "implementation mosaics" than to our "philosophical mosaics."

Philosophically, it seems safe to say that a large majority of career education practitioners and conceptualizers are committed to implementing career education through a combination of what have been called "fusion" and "collaborative" efforts. This paper represents an attempt to identify and discuss the bedrock implementation issues associated with both of these key words.

Implementation Issues In Infusion

Three basic implementation issues exist with respect to infusion. First, should the prime implementation emphasis be on "education" or on "careers?" Second, is the concept of "threading" preferable to the concept of "infusing?" Third, what kind of balance should be struck between "goals" and "concepts" in our implementation efforts? Each of these three basic issue questions, of course, includes a host of related sub-questions.

Implementing Career Education: "Careers" or "Education" As a Basic Thrust

Philosophically, career education has been pictured as a *vehicle* for educational *reform*. *Operationally*, current in-service efforts seem to be emphasizing "careers" as an *end* rather than as a *means* to the end of educational reform. The key practical question to be faced is, "Is the career education effort willing to be evaluated, in part, on the basis of its demonstrated ability to improve academic achievement?" If that queston is answered affirmatively, then it is obvious that the primary implementation focus must be oriented around the teaching/learning process with the substance of "careers" being used as a vehicle for doing so.

An implementation model for teacher in-service in career education can be constructed around four basic changes being sought in the teaching/learning

process. For each such change, a "careers" emphasis can be pictured as a vehicle for attaining change. The model can be illustrated in the following way:

A. *Change I:* Toward giving more meaning and purpose to the work of both teacher and student. As a *vehicle* for change, career education encourages an emphasis, where appropriate, on the fact that people *use* the knowledge being taught in the world of paid employment.
B. *Change II:* Toward a "success," rather than a "failure" oriented approach to the teaching/learning process. As a *vehicle* for change, career education encourages positive rewards to students for their accomplishments–i.e., for the *work* they do as students–by emphasizing the importance of developing favorable student attitudes toward work.
C. *Change III.* Toward increasing the use of variety in the teaching/learning process. As a *vehicle* for change, career education emphasizes that students can and do learn about work in more ways than from textbooks, in more places than in classrooms, and from more people than certified teachers.
D. *Change IV:* Toward greater involvement of the community in the teaching/learning process. As a *vehicle* for change, career education emphasizes that a wide variety of community resources can and should be used in helping students through the career development process.

To begin, teacher career education in-service efforts with this general approach to change in the teaching/learning process is to provide teachers with a perspective that can be useful in emphasizing *any* basic goal of education. If teachers can learn by means of the career education vehicle, they can improve their effectiveness in attaining other educational goals as well. This should help keep career education's emphasis on "education as preparation for work" in proper perspective as one among several basic goals of American education.

Each of these four generic kinds of changes–(a) a sense of purposefulness; (b) rewards for accomplishments; (c) increasing variety; and (d) full utilization of all available resources–are ones that have been shown to increase industrial productivity. There is every reason to believe that they can also be used to increase educational productivity–i.e., academic achievement. Unless we can demonstrate that a career education approach improves academic achievement, career education will fail as a *reform* effort. The teaching/learning process, not the substance of careers, is the basic ingredient in improving academic achievement.

The basic issue under discussion here is whether or not increases in academic achievement represent a reasonable criterion for use in evaluating the effects of career education. If it is, then curriculum/instruction specialists become fully as important as career development specialists in implementing career education. If it is not, then career education is merely an extension of career development, not an educational reform movement. As we move from conceptualization to implementation, this issue must be faced and resolved.

Implementing Career Education: "Infusing" or "Threading"

The word "infusion" has been used, by career education advocates, to represent a goal of trying to encourage all teachers to incorporate career education concepts in their classrooms—as opposed to adding a new course called "careers." Some teachers have resisted on the grounds that, to "infuse" a new substance into an already "full" curriculum necessarily results in something "spilling over."

It has been common practice to concentrate teacher in-service career education efforts around helping teachers become familiar with a variety of career education concepts and then arrange such concepts into a scope and sequence pattern for use in infusion. These concepts, drawn primarily from the area of career development, have appeared to many teachers to represent new subject matter to be taught. It is not surprising that many, as a result, have constructed "career education lessons" or "career education units" through which they seek to impart these concepts to students. This inevitably leads to loss of time available to teach the subject matter itself. It has resulted in much criticism and much resistance.

Recently, Marvin Harmon, Oregon State Coordinator of Career Education, and Carolyn Raymond, Career Education Coordinator, Mesa, Arizona, had suggested that the word "thread" be substituted for the word "infuse" in the career education concept. They reason that one can "thread" experiential learning into a body of cognitive content in ways that will reinforce, not detract from, the emphasis on acquisition of cognitive content. In my opinion, Marvin Harmon and Carolyn Raymond have made a significant conceptual "breakthrough" with this proposal.

Implementing Career Education: Concepts or Goals

It has become common practice, among those seeking to implement career education in classrooms, to encourage teachers to develop career education "lessons," "learning packages," or "units" around particular career education concepts. Typically, these have been organized in an "activity" mode aimed at helping students learn particular career education concepts *experientially* while concentrating cognitive aspects of the teaching/learning process on a particular body of academic subject matter. Familiar examples of "career education concepts" include the following:

1. Occupations exist for a purpose.
2. There is need for cooperation in work.
3. Occupations and life-styles are interrelated.
4. Value judgments influence vocational choice
5. Geographical settings affect work.
6. Society provides rewards for work.
7. Man and technology are continually interacting in work.

Each of these "concepts" is aimed at helping the student better understand self, the occupational society, education/work relationships and/or the broader society with an apparent goal of making positive contributions to the student's career development–particularly as it relates to career decisions. The net effect is to make the teacher an active participant in the career development process.

There is no question regarding the worth of this kind of effort. Rather, the question is, "Does this kind of orientation adequately represent the teacher's role in career education?" A further question is, "Do we teach career education concepts to teachers primarily so they can pass such concepts on to students?" As we move toward a massive implementation phase in career education, questions such as these must be answered.

It may well be worthwhile considering structuring teacher career education inservice efforts around a broader set of expected student outcomes. What if, instead of concentrating major attention on helping teachers understand and plan ways of transmitting career education concepts to students, we instead aimed such efforts at showing teachers how they might help students to acquire:

1. Increased academic achievement
2. Improved work habits
3. A personally meaningful set of work values
4. Increased self-understanding
5. Increased understanding of the occupational society
6. Increased understanding of education/work relationships
7. Increased decision-making skills
8. Effective means of combatting both race and sex stereotyping
9. Job seeking, job getting, and job holding skills

If teachers were to incorporate one or more of those career education student outcome goals listed above, into their existing lesson goals, it might well involve teachers in activities considerably beyond simply helping students understand the career education "concepts." In addition, it might help many teachers discover for themselves–and help them to help their students discover–increased reasons for studying subject matter. If such student outcomes were incorporated into teacher objectives, it might be easier to show teachers how to "thread" career education concepts into lesson activity packages.

The basic point here is simple and straightforward. If student career education outcomes can be "threaded" into teacher instructional objectives, they become an integral part of the teaching/learning process. Unless this can be accomplished, teacher attempts to "thread" career education concepts into student activities may encounter difficulty. More important, to "thread" student career education learner outcomes into teacher instructional objectives is to come closer to realizing the full potential for teacher participation in career education.

Implementation Issues in Collaboration

The principle of collaboration, as envisioned in career education, involves joint responsibility and participation of both the business/labor/industry/professional community and the formal education system in policy formulation and policy decision-making. To date, this principle has been rarely applied in career education implementation efforts. Instead, what we have seen would more correctly be described as "cooperation"—expressed as efforts of the broader community to help the formal education system with *its*—the education system's—career education efforts.

The bedrock question to be asked, then, is whether or not true collaboration is to be a goal of career education implementation efforts. If so, how much collaboration is to take place? How will it be achieved? Here, four possible stages of collaboration will be identified. Decisions must be made regarding how far, if at all, we should go in these collaborative stages.

Stage 1: Supplying Information

A beginning stage of collaboration is represented by efforts to simply collect information from the broader community for use by educators in career education. This would include, for example: (a) information regarding the local occupational structure; (b) information regarding economic education and the free enterprise system; (c) information regarding organized labor; and (d) information regarding part-time and full-time job opportunities.

Such information has, to date, been collected either through: (a) responses to requests made by the education system; or (b) information volunteered to the education system by the broader community. The mode has been one of *cooperation*, but not of *collaboration*.

If a collaborative effort is to be initiated, it would demand, first of all, formation of a Community Career Education Council with representation from all pertinent segments of the business/labor/industry/professional/government community, the home/family structure, and the formal education system (including students). Such a council could then be asked to make policy decisions with respect to such questions as:

1. What kinds of information are desired?
2. How should such information be collected?
3. Who should judge the appropriateness of the information?
4. Who will be responsible for transmitting such information to students?

It should be fairly easy to utilize the concept of collaboration in forming policy answers to the first two of these four questions. It will be considerably more difficult with Questions 3 and 4. That is, with these questions, legal responsibilities of the formal education system (which *must* be met) may lead

some educators to feel it inappropriate to raise them as *policy* issues with the council.

Stage 2: Use of Resource Persons and Field Trips

Both the use of resource persons from the broader community in the classroom and field trips for students and educators into the broader community have become common practice in career education. Here, again, such activities have typically been initiated by the formal education system and the broader community has been asked to *cooperate* in such efforts. True collaboration has been the exception, not the rule.

If career education is to be implemented in a collaborative fashion, there are a host of *policy* questions that the Community Career Education Action Council should be asked to make. These include:

1. Who is to judge the qualifications of resource persons?
2. Who is to determine the need for resource persons?
3. Who is to control the availability and use of resource persons?
4. Who is to be responsible for the resource person getting together with the teacher to plan classroom activities? How are such decisions to be made?
5. Who will evaluate the effectiveness of resource persons? To whom will such evaluations be sent? Who will make decisions based on such evaluations?
6. Who will determine the availability of field trip sites?
7. Who will determine the suitability of a particular site for a particular field trip the teacher desires to make?
8. Who will control the frequency of use of field trip sites?
9. Who will prepare educators for the field trips?
10. Who will evaluate the usefulness of field trips? To whom will such evaluations be sent? Who will make decisions based on such evaluations?
11. Who will determine what students will see and the persons they visit with on a field trip?

Unless the broader community—including business, organized labor, industry, and parents—can, through their representatives on the council, help determine *policy* answers to questions such as these, it is difficult to see how they can be expected to assume a share of the responsibility for effectiveness of the career education effort. Unless they are willing to share this *responsibility for effectiveness*, career education will be simply a *school* effort, not a *community* effort. If this occurs, the beautiful philosophical mosaic of career education will be badly tarnished by operational implementation efforts.

Stage 3: Simulation of the World of Work in Formal Education

For a host of very practical reasons, many school systems have initiated two general career education approaches designed to reduce the necessity for direct interaction of students with members of the business/labor/industry/professional community. One of these consists of the use of slide tapes, videotapes, etc. produced during field trips taken by some students and used, within the school setting, as a substitute for such field trips on the part of other students. The second consists of simulation devices and activities designed to provide a vicarious form of "hands on" career exploration for students who cannot acquire such experiences in actual occupational settings.

While decisions with respect to these two kinds of activities have, to date, generally been made by school officials alone, there is good reason to suggest that a number of *policy* questions regarding them could appropriately be made by a Community Career Education Action Council. Such questions include:

1. How representative are the slide tapes, etc. of the particular occupations and/or industries they are supposed to represent?
2. What important messages from the business/labor/industry/professional community are found in these materials that should be transmitted?
3. How necessary is it to limit student field trips by use of the slide tape, videotape, etc. mode of operation?
4. What kinds simulation "hands on" exercises would most clearly allow students to experience what it would be like if they attempted to use skills required in various occupations?
5. How could, and should, simulated "hands on" career exploration activities be evaluated? How could they be scored?
6. What is the general desirability of using simulated "hands on" career exploration devices and activities as a substitute for the "real thing?"

To involve council members in formulation of *policy* answers to questions such as these holds clear potential for increasing the value of materials and devices being used. More important, it gives the broader community a voice in determining the extent to which responsibility for providing students with these kinds of experiences should lie *within* the formal education system. Without this kind of protection, there will be a natural tendency, on the part of many educators, to move increasing amounts to the "safe" confines of school buildings—thus increasing isolation of both educators and students from the occupational society itself. It is a danger that all in career education must seek to avoid.

Stage 4: Experiential Education Activities

Potential for the most advanced stage of collaboration is greater with respect to activities falling under the general heading of work experience. While collaboration has, hopefully, been illustrated here as being possible in each of

the three earlier stages, it is absolutely essential when the generic topic of work experience enters in. This is true whether one is speaking of paid or unpaid work experience. In either case, *policy* questions exist that should be considered by a Community Career Education Action Council, not resolved by educators alone. Such questions include the following:

1. Should both paid and unpaid work experience be considered as part of career education? Or should only unpaid work experience be considered?
2. To what extent, if at all, should unpaid work experience carry responsibility, on the part of the student, for contributing to productivity for the employer?
3. What kind of time frame should be considered adequate for attainment of the career exploratory benefits of unpaid work experience?
4. Should some form of work experience (including internships) be made available to all secondary and postsecondary students?
5. What is the earliest age at which actual work experience should be made part of the career education effort?
6. Who should determine the nature of the work experience?
7. Who should supervise the student during the work experience period?
8. Who should evaluate the work experience? How do such evaluations relate to academic credit (if the school system elects to grant it)?
9. How are employed workers to be protected from possible misuse of high school and postsecondary work experience efforts?

These are but illustrations of the kinds of basic *policy* questions that must be raised with respect to work experience. Overriding such questions are, of course, two even more basic ones; namely, (a) should work experience (in any form) be considered as part of a comprehensive career education effort?; and (b) what benefits are expected to accrue to students from work experience? Certainly, these are not questions that can be answered satisfactorily by educators alone.

Two basic, bedrock implementation issues have been raised here. The first is concerned with whether or not career education is *truly* to be pictured as an educational *reform* effort. If that question is answered affirmatively, then it logically follows that: (a) academic achievement will represent one criterion on which the effectiveness of career education must be evaluated; and (b) the teaching/learning process will be fully as important as the career development process in career education implementation efforts.

The second bedrock issue is whether career education implementation efforts should be carried out in a collaborative, or in a cooperative, fashion. If the collaboration route is chosen, then it will demand considerable more community participation in policy making than has been evidenced to date. It will also mean a commitment to avoid the ever present danger of making career education primarily yet another attempt of educators to help students through the formal education system alone.

Both of these issues have been raised and resolved by those who have formulated philosophical mosaics for career education. In the long run, it is practice, not philosophy, that will form the basis on which career education is judged. As we move from a *primary* focus on conceptualization to the *primary* focus on implementation, it is crucial that these implementation issues be faced and resolved. We should do this *now*.

THE HUMAN SIDE OF WORK

Some papers are written primarily for purposes of spreading knowledge. Others are written primarily for purposes of seeking knowledge. This paper falls in the latter category. The thoughts to be expressed here will clearly illustrate my need for help in clarifying my thinking and gaining new knowledge. Hopefully, they will stimulate others to contribute to the task of decreasing ignorance.

For one to speak about the "human" side of work is to admit that other facets of work also exist. The most obvious of these, in a polarized sense is, of course, what would be called the "inhuman" side of work. Thus, while there is no need here to discuss the entire set of meanings that might be attached to the word "work," there is certainly an obligation to touch briefly on the "inhuman," as well as the "human" side of work in these remarks.

Further, I must limit these remarks to current concerns of OE's Office of Career Education. The broader–and obviously more important and far reaching concerns of the entire HEW/DOL/DOC education/work effort–are not covered here.

These remarks, then, are limited to implications of the topic for the career education concept. They are divided into four parts. First, I want to present a brief history of how my initial thinking on the topic has begun to emerge into a broader view. Second, I want to present my current thinking regarding implications the word "work" holds for changes in American Education. Third, I want to discuss briefly a few of the major problems facing those who wish to emphasize the "human side of work." Finally, I will close with brief remarks regarding challenges that lie ahead.

The Centrality of Work in Career Education: An Evolving Process

The term "career education" met with initial nationwide enthusiasm when first introduced by former USOE Commissioner Sidney P. Marland, Jr., in 1971. It is not clear exactly why putting the two words "career" and "education" together produced such a positive response. That is, when first introduced, "career education" was simply an idea looking for a conceptual base. Marland purposely–and, in my opinion, wisely–refused to define it.

The rhetoric aimed at converting the idea into a concept began almost immediately. The earliest statements were both conflicting and confusing and included statements such as:

–We need a new name for vocational education–and that new name should be career education

–All education is career education–or should be

–Career education aims to fuse academic and vocational education

A general feeling seemed to exist that education should change in ways that would help students make a more successful transition from school to work—but few seemed to know how schools should change or exactly what the problem was.

Two idealogical camps quickly emerged, each of which seemed intent on using a particular four-letter word as the bedrock conceptual base for career education. One camp chose the four-letter word "jobs" while the other chose the four-letter word "life." In March of 1971, I decided to introduce yet another four-letter word—namely, "work"—as the proper bedrock word in the career education concept. That is where it all began.

I rejected the word "jobs" as a conceptual base for two reasons. First, it seemed apparent that education, as only one part of society, could play only a relatively small role in determining whether or not jobs would be available for youth. I did not want to tie accountability for career education to a word that is influenced by so many other societal factors. Second, to use "jobs" as the conceptual base would have made the need for career education a function of changing demands of the economic system. I wanted the primary focus to be on the individual, not on the economic system.

I rejected the word "life" because it seemed to me so vague and all-encompassing as to defy practical use in the reform of education. Moreover, it did not seem responsive to the general feeling of need for change that gave popularity to the term "career education" when it was introduced.

On the other hand, I chose the word "work" for two initial reasons. First, it seemed to me to be a word that should draw support from very diverse segments of society. I viewed it as a word that almost everyone would understand and almost no one would want to oppose. I was, of course, wrong on both counts.

Second, I chose the word "work" because of my interest in the ways in which work values are changing in the post-industrial, information-centered, technological society of these times. Education has always played a role in transmitting societal values to students. Why, I reasoned, should we not include work values in this effort? If the term "career education" is to represent something over and beyond what education has been doing to date—i.e., providing students with specific vocational skills required for entering the labor market—then it seemed to me work values represented a worthy and needed direction for expansion of effort. I must admit that, at that point in time—late 1971—I did not realize how much more the term "career education" should mean. I knew only that I wanted the bedrock conceptual word to be "work" and that I wanted to develop the concept in a work values sense.

The Meaning of Work: What it is Not

As I started grappling with further conceptual efforts, it became obvious that, if work values are involved, then the word "work" must be defined in humanistic terms. Three things quickly became apparent.

First, I became convinced that I had to reject the popular rhetoric of the early 1970's that heard people calling for a return of the "work ethic." The word "ethic" implies a kind of societal obligation to work–that one owes it to society to work whether or not it is something the individual desires to do. In studying the literature on the so-called "work ethic," it seemed obvious to me that many persons had, in the past, tried to put this societal obligation in religious terms. The basic reasoning seemed to go something like this:

> You were put on earth by your creator to improve the world in some way. If you devote your life to doing so, you will go to heaven when you die. If you do not, you will go to hell.

With the way both "heaven" and "hell" were described, it is easy to see how those who believed such words would be motivated to work. Others–especially during the 1970-72 period–seemed to be talking about the "work ethic" in patriotic terms.

> You owe it to your country to work. It is part of your responsibilities as a good citizen. Those who don't want to work aren't good citizens.

There was no way I could see asking American education, which supposedly exists for purposes of providing persons with the means to control their own destinies, to start inculcating youth with any form of the so-called "work ethic." Moreover, even were we to try to do so, it seemed to me that it would have minimal appeal to many of today's youth. For both of these reasons, I soon became convinced that, however the word "work" has to be defined, it should not be done in a "work ethic" sense.

Second, I quickly discovered that the word "work" does not carry positive connotations for many in society–and that this is not a new thing. A language arts teacher recently sent me a number of quotations illustrating that point including, for example, the following:

> Charles Dickins–"My Life is One Demd Horrid Grind"
>
> Charles Lamb–"Who First Invented Work and Bound the Free?"
>
> Wm. Shakespeare–"O, How Full of Briers is This Working-Day World!"
>
> Rudyard Kipling–"More Men are Killed by Overwork than the Importance of the World Justifies"
>
> "Peanuts"–"Work is the Crabgrass on the Lawn of Life"

It is obvious that such statements refer to the fact that, even where people find work *possible*, many find it neither *meaningful* nor *satisfying*. They do not

see what they do as important to society nor intrinsically satisfying to themselves. The personal sense of meaningfulness and purposefulness that makes the difference between "living" and "existing" is gone. To such persons, their jobs in the world of paid employment become primarily a way of accumulating money which is then used in other life role activities supposedly aimed at bringing meaning and purpose to their existence. Their on-the-job behavior is characterized by such qualities as coming to work as late as possible, doing as little as possible, lacking in personal loyalty to or concern for their employer, and valuing primarily those activities in which they engage when not at the job site.

Philosophers such as Thomas Green characterize this type of behavior as "labor," not as "work." It seems to me the word "drudgery" may be more descriptive than the word "labor" in describing this kind of behavior. I would call such persons "drudgers" rather than "workers." By whatever name, the condition seems to be both real and serious. When one considers the proportion of life most persons spend in the world of paid employment, it becomes even more serious to those of us concerned with helping individuals find purpose and meaning in their lives.

Third, it became apparent to me that, however "work" is to be defined, it cannot be limited to the world of paid employment. That is, the obviously dehumanizing conditions found in parts of today's world of paid employment are formidable barriers. If education is to be successful in making work possible, meaningful, *and* satisfying to all—or even most—persons, we must think in broader lifestyle terms. (Note: This is not at all a new concept. Labor economists, for example, have for years written about what they call "market" and "non-market" work.)

The Meaning of Work: What It Is

In order to convey my concerns and hopes for career education, it became necessary for me to formulate a definition of "work." I did so shortly prior to coming to the U.S. Office of Education in 1974 and that definition is currently being used by the Office of Career Education in OE. It says:

> Work is conscious effort, other than that whose primary purpose is either coping or relaxation, aimed at producing benefits for oneself or for oneself and others.

There are four key words in this definition. The first is the word "conscious." It seems crucial to me that, if a given activity is to be called "work"—as opposed to "drudgery"—it must be something the individual has *chosen* to do. If the activity is performed unwillingly because of external pressure or coercion, it is not "work." The reasons why a given individual chooses to work may vary considerably, of course, and may certainly include economic as well as any other reasons that may be present.

The second key word in this definition is "effort." If the activity is to be called "work," then some degree of difficulty must be involved in carrying it out. Without effort–the expenditure of energy–there is no way I can think of any activity as deserving to be called "work."

The third key word is "produce." I use this word to mean that, if the activity is to be called "work," then some clear outcome must be sought. This is, in essence, the quality of purposefulness–the knowledge that it is important the activity be completed in the best possible way. It is a matter of cognition.

The fourth key word is "benefit." I use this word to mean that, if the activity is to be called "work," then it must be designed to help, not to hurt, people. This is, in essence, the quality of personal satisfaction that work should bring to the individual–the feeling that someone's life has been enriched because of the activity. It is an affective, not a cognitive, matter.

It should be obvious that this definition has been formulated around what I regard as a basic human need of all human beings–namely, the need to *do*–to accomplish–to achieve. It is the need to know that I *am* someone because I have *done* something. It is the feeling that someone needs me for something–that, because I exist and I have *done*, the world is, in some way and to some extent, better off.

I am firmly convinced that the quality of "work," as I have defined it, is the clearest means available to the individual for developing the kind of positive self concept that allows the individual to say "I am a worthwhile person." I am further convinced that if the goal is one of increasing self understanding, then the quality of "work" is the best and clearest means available to us for attainment of that goal. In saying this, I do not mean to downplay the importance of existential, religious, or other bases that can also be utilized for this purpose. I simply mean to emphasize the potential of the concept of *work*.

More important, "work," as I have defined it, is the best and clearest way I know to help the individual know *why* he/she exists. It brings purposefulness and meaningfulness to our lives. It is a way that each of us can use to understand that it is important that we are living today–and a reason for wanting to live tomorrow. Again, let me emphasize that I do not mean to imply it is the *only* way, but only that it is a very good one.

Taken together, then, "work" allows the individual to say "I am an important person because of what I have done and it is important that I continue to exist." Unfortunately, it seems to me that this is a statement that many persons in our current society find difficult to make in terms of their current lifestyles.

As was pointed out with respect to negative views some have of the meaning of "work," the kind of positive view I am trying to express here is not new. I am sure that many persons are familiar with the expression "work is love made visible" which, in essence, says what I am trying to convey here. Let me give you two other examples from the past which I like very much:

> Sir William Osler–"Though a little one, the master-word *work* looms large in meaning. It is the open sesame to every portal, the great

> equalizer, in the world, the true philosopher's stone which transmutes all the base metal of humanity into gold."
>
> John Ruskin—"In order that people may be happy in their work: These three things are needed: They must be for it; they must not do too much of it; and they must have a sense of success in it."

I particularly like John Ruskin's statement in that he both emphasizes the importance of "work" being defined by the individual and the fact that, important as it is, "work" cannot be considered to be the only worthwhile activity in life.

With the definition of "work" formulated here, it is obvious that it is a quality that may or may not be found by the individual in the world of paid employment. It is equally obvious that "work" can exist in many parts of the individual's lifestyle over and beyond the world of paid employment. Room exists in this definition for conceptualizing work in volunteerism, work as part of productive use of one's leisure time, work in the changing home/family patterns of our nation, and *work* of the student, and work in which persons on welfare are engaged.

Recently, OE's Office of Career Education contracted with the Distinguished Vocational Psychologist, Dr. Donald E. Super, to write a monograph for us on the topic "Career Education and the Meanings of Work." I would like to quote the way Super defined the word "work" in that monograph:

> Work—the systematic pursuit of an objective valued by oneself (even if only for survival) and desired by others: Directed and consecutive, it requires the expenditure of effort. It may be compensated (paid work) or uncompensated (volunteer work or an avocation). The objective may be intrinsic enjoyment of the work itself, the structure given to life by the work role, the economic support which work makes possible, or the type of leisure which it facilitates.

I can see no inconsistencies of a basic nature between my definition of "work" and that supplied by Super. Neither do I view my definition as differing, in basic meaning, from the thoughts expressed years ago by persons such as Sir William Osler and John Ruskin. The idea is neither new nor inconsistent with the thinking of some others.

Difficulties Encountered With the Definition of "Work"

Several serious obstacles currently exist which, in various combinations, are causing me great difficulty in gaining wide acceptance for the definition of "work" that I am proposing. I want to discuss some of these briefly in hopes that others may be able to help me move toward finding satisfactory solutions.

First, it should be obvious that, with this definition, what deserves to be called "work" is, in a very real way, defined by the individual's purposes in performing the activity, not by the activity itself. That is, playing golf may be work to one person but pure recreation to another. I see no way around this difficulty if meaningfulness and purposefulness for the individual is to be kept as a central part of the definition. Yet, it is bound to be confusing to those who want a strict categorization system whereby some activities can be labeled "work" and others as "recreation," "play," or some other "non-work" word.

Second, it is even more obvious that the definition I am using varies considerably from that which is commonly understood by most persons in our society at the present time. So far as I can tell, most persons today think of "work" in the way I think of "drudgery." That is, the word "work" seems to conjure up negative images of something distasteful, unpleasant, and to be avoided whenever possible. In my opinion, this disparity in meaning is more accurately viewed as justifying the need for a new definition than as an excuse for failing to do so. There is no way that I can justify abandoning my efforts to redefine "work" simply because the task is difficult.

Third, with the definition of "work" I am using, it is clear that, in many jobs found in our society, "drudgery," not "work," is the most common characteristic. I am faced with recognizing that, for many persons, what I have called "work" will have to be found much more frequently as part of leisure time than as part of one's experiences in the world of paid employment. The phrase "the world of work" is not at all synonymous with the phrase "the world of paid employment." This, too, is bound to cause great difficulty in gaining understanding and acceptance of what we are trying to do in the name of career education.

Fourth, when one uses a values orientation in defining "work," there is no way of doing so logically unless one recognizes that economic values, for most persons, lie at the base of their system of work values. It is almost analogous, in Maslow's terms, to thinking of individual needs which begin with "survival" and go, in a hierarchical order, on up to "self actualization." Individuals can be expected to encounter great difficulty incorporating multiple work values into their personal value structures until, at least to some minimal degree, their economic needs are met. Thus, the "world of paid employment" is a crucial and central part of the "world of work." It would be both dishonest and unrealistic if, in our attempts to help individuals find "work" in their total lifestyle, we ignored the "world of paid employment" as a major focus of our efforts.

Finally, career education must be much more than simply helping individuals discover work values that foster in them a *desire* to work. If that were all that is done, the result is likely to be more frustrating than helpful. The call for career education originated out of difficulties individuals are encountering in coping with the current rapidity of social and occupational change. In the long run, the goal must be one of helping individuals gain a greater degree of control over their destinies, not simply learning how to adjust to the "system." That is why, in career education, an emphasis on work values represents only one of our major

thrusts. In addition, we emphasize the importance of acquisition of basic academic skills, skills in productive use of leisure time, career decision-making skills, skills in dealing with problems of race/sex occupational stereotyping, and job-seeking, job-getting, and job-holding skills. Thus, career education seeks to broaden the goal of "education as preparation for work" far beyond an emphasis on providing youth with specific vocational skills required for *entry* into the world of paid employment. Career education seeks to extend this emphasis in ways that will enable individuals to change with change in society in a more self-fulfilling fashion than simply adjusting to external changes they encounter.

Implications for American Education

To use the word "work" as the bedrock for the career education concept holds great implications for change in American education. This discussion would be incomplete, indeed, if it failed to identify some of the major implications of this.

First, if we seek to foster positive work values in students that will lead them to desire to work, we must begin by concentrating our attention on the *work* of the student *in the classroom*. To humanize the student's workplace—i.e., the classroom—the first requirement is to make the student's work meaningful and purposeful to him/her. We must simultaneously recognize and emphasize the need to make the *work* of the teacher both meaningful and purposeful to teachers. This means that the classroom must move beyond an emphasis on process and content objectives toward an emphasis on the goals of education—on why it is important for students to learn what teachers are trying to teach. Several years ago, this generic problem was raised under the banner of "relevancy." We forgot, at that time, to ask the basic question of *when* what we teach is supposed to be relevant. Today? next week? next year? 20 years from now? Career education, in its attempt to bring a proper emphasis to the goal of "education as preparation for work" can and should serve as an effective *vehicle* for bringing more than an immediate sense of purposefulness and meaningfulness to the teaching/learning process. To the extent this happens, progress can be made toward humanizing the workplace of both student and teacher.

Second, it would be a tragic mistake if, in our zeal to emphasize education as preparation for work, we neglected other basic goals of American education. The process objectives of the various disciplines hold implications for utility far beyond those associated with the goal of "education as preparation for work." English teaches the process of communication: The social sciences teach the process of critical thinking: Mathematics teaches the process of logical reasoning: The physical sciences teach the process of scientific thought: The arts and humanities teach the process of creativity and self-discovery. It is obviously easy for teachers in each of these disciplines to show their students the value of such processes as preparation for work—to emphasize that one of the reasons for mastering the process is that people use it in their work—including their work in the world of paid employment. It is vital that teachers also emphasize the many

additional basic goals of education that also relate to the need for students to master these processes.

Third, it seems vitally important to me that American education assume some responsibility for solving the problem of dehumanizing conditions in the world of paid employment. Obviously, a very large portion of that problem will be solved only as employers and employees join forces to create more humanizing job conditions. It is important to recognize, however, that jobs are not necessarily equally dehumanizing for all persons holding them. The "liberating" power of the liberal arts can certainly be utilized by the individual as a means of humanizing the workplace for himself/herself. There is much talk today about something called the "over-educated worker." I, for one, reject that concept absolutely. It is one that could be defended only if one were to assume the only goal of education was to prepare persons for the world of paid employment. Let us hope that never happens.

On the other hand, the concept of the "over-qualified worker"—defined as one whose knowledge and skills are broader than his/her particular job demands—is a valid one. It is a concept that seems certain to grow in importance in the years ahead. As this happens, the need for an emphasis on the liberal arts will also grow. The worker finds meaning and purpose in his/her work. It is not something given to the worker by the job.

There *is* a human side of work. Here, I have tried to describe my current thoughts regarding its need and nature. The incompleteness of these thoughts simply reflects my own need for help—and my hope that others will continue to join me in this very important effort called career education that seeks answers to the problem.

CAREER EDUCATION IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: AN EVOLVING CONCEPT

The philosophical foundations of the community college movement and the career education concept have much in common. (Hoyt, 1973). As a result, it would be difficult to identify any community college where no "bits and pieces" of career education exist. Unfortunately, this leads to a "we're already doing it" kind of reaction when the topic of career education is raised with many community college experts. To offset this, I would like to begin with a bold assertion that, so far as I know, comprehensive, bonafide career education efforts are extremely rare in community college settings today. These remarks will hopefully hold greatest meaning for those who disagree violently with that assertion.

It would be both foolish and futile to construct and defend an idealistic model for career education in the community college at the present time. Too many variables including: (a) the great diversity of kinds of students served in one community college as opposed to another; (b) the large number of unknown factors that will determine the future of the community college movement in our nation; and (c) the still evolving nature of the career education concept. On the other hand, to use such variables as an excuse for failing to devote serious thought to the problem is to engage in professionally irresponsible behavior.

Thus, these remarks are aimed at identification of several major problems that appear to be common across most community college settings. For each, I will attempt to outline my own *current* position. My hope is that, by doing so, all of us will be better equipped to help each other develop better and more defensible positions. I, for one, readily acknowledge my own personal need for such help.

Many of the thoughts to be expressed here represent things I have learned from participants in two of the OCE "mini-conferences" held during the 1976-77 academic year. One involved 12 community college career education "experts" identified through a nationwide nomination procedure. The second involved four additional community college career education experts identified by AACJC. While the help of these "mini-conference" participants is gratefully acknowledged, I hasten to add that none should be held accountable for these remarks.

I want to begin with a brief discussion of several variables that combine to prevent us from formulating a single community college career education model at the present time. This will necessarily be accompanied by some predictions regarding the future nature of the community college student body. Following this, I would like to comment briefly on the significance of the word "community" for career education in the community college. Finally, I will offer some thoughts on what I currently regard as basic elements in a comprehensive community college career education effort.

Variables and Predictions

Community colleges, because each aims to serve a different community, are necessarily more distinguished by their diversity than by their similarities. Several of these hold direct implications for those concerned with developing a model for community college career education efforts. The three most significant sources of variation to consider here are: (a) size and geographic location; (b) age levels of students served; and (c) the relative emphasis placed on occupational education as opposed to the liberal arts. To attempt to use a single model for the community college in Hutchinson, Kansas and in Dade County, Florida would be doomed to failure both because of differences of size and in the rural, as opposed to the urban, setting. Even within the large urban setting, it seems fruitless to attempt to impose the same model on LaGuardia Community College in New York City–where 80% of students are recent high school graduates–and Wayne County Community College in Detroit–where only 25% are recent high school graduates. The strong liberal arts emphasis found in the community college in Ocean County, New Jersey, as opposed to the strong occupational education emphasis present in Kirkwood Community College at Cedar Rapids, Iowa pose very different implementation problems.

Of these three variables, the most significant, in terms of implications for career education efforts in community colleges are concerned, is the age distribution of students who choose to enroll. While, of course, numerous exceptions can be found, it seems safe to venture a few generalizations regarding needs of younger students, as opposed to older adults, for career education in the community college.

The young high school graduate seeking admission to the community college is often unsure regarding career goals. At the same time, strong societal pressures are brought to bear urging him/her to make career decisions. Some students succumb by immediately enrolling in a specific occupational education program. Others resist by enrolling in only the liberal arts offerings which, they contend, will be helpful to them no matter what kind of occupation they eventually enter. The need to traverse the "rites of passage" from youth to adulthood lead a great majority of these students to seek "college credit" for almost any kind of educational experience they undergo at the community college. Increasingly, this is including requests that they receive "academic credit" for experiences aimed at such goals as career awareness, exploration, planning, and decision-making–including those activities having some work experience component.

The older adult, on the other hand, is very often an individual who enrolls in the community college for purposes of broadening his/her total lifestyle, not for purposes of acquiring entry-level occupational skills. Somehow, it seems to have become respectable to value the broader array of educational goals if one is firmly established in an occupational role. Partly, perhaps, because they *are* adults, older students seem less worried about whether or not a particular learning experience carries "academic credit" and more worried about whether or not it meets their felt educational needs. I have a distinct feeling that adult

students in the community college who enroll for specific purposes of making mid-career occupational changes are in the minority—even among those called "adult students." That is, among the total population of adults who could benefit from community college attendance, I believe the problems of those faced with traumatic decisions regarding mid-career specific occupational change have been overemphasized. Important as these problems and these persons are, they do not seem to me to be either the most important or the most numerous.

As an "outsider" to the community college movement, I feel free to make some predictions regarding the future nature of community college students without being inhibited by specific knowledge regarding the community college movement. These "outsider" predictions may find their primary utility in serving as "attack points" for rebuttals by community college experts. Even that would, it seems to me, be useful.

First, I predict that the average age of community college students will increase substantially in the next ten years. In addition to the usual actuarial reasons for making this prediction, there are two other factors operating. One is the current rapid growth of vocational/technical education institutions who, increasingly, serve both secondary and postsecondary students. I have a feeling that they can be expected to draw significant numbers of both recent high school graduates and adults who seek specific occupational skills required for immediate job entry. The second is what I regard as an inevitable move, on the part of our system of State colleges and universities, to seek to attract liberal arts students during the Freshman and Sophomore years. They almost have to move in this direction in terms of their own survival needs. I have a distinct feeling that the current trend toward placing "caps" on community college enrolments may well be related to this need. Both of these will, it seems to me, tend to cut into what would otherwise be a continuing increase in community college enrolments.

Second, and related to the first, I predict that, increasingly, community colleges will find the career education needs of their older adult students centering around (a) the need for upgrading in occupational skills related to their current occupations; and/or (b) the need to acquire skills and knowledge useful in helping them make more productive use of leisure time—to help them lead fuller, more satisfying lives. To the extent that this prediction is accurate, it may well be that the goal of "education as preparation for work" will, for many adult students, be translated primarily in terms of unpaid work carried out as productive use of leisure time—not as preparation for the world of paid employment. When applied to the world of paid employment, that goal, it seems to me will, for increasing numbers of adults, be translated in terms of acquiring skills required for adapting to changes within their chosen occupational field rather than in seeking a new and completely different set of occupational skills.

To the extent to which either of these two predictions is accurate, career education in the community college will certainly be much different in nature, than those efforts now serving as models at the K-12 level.

The "Community" in Community College Career Education Efforts

The concept of "collaboration" was a key ingredient in career education when the movement was launched in 1971. That concept was picked up by Willard Wirtz and his associates when they produced *The Boundless Resource* several years later. It is currently being further championed through creation of a number of demonstration "community education/work councils" funded largely with Department of Labor funds. A recent DOL grant to AACJC has resulted in an important effort to demonstrate a leadership role for the community college in the community education/work collaborative effort. Because the total effort is so directly tied into career education, OE's Office of Career Education is investing a substantial amount of funds into the total National Manpower Institute project. Whether or not some of these OCE funds is used in those five communities where community colleges are taking leadership roles has yet to be determined. In any event, there are four aspects of this total concept that deserve discussion here.

First, and most important, I would hope that no community college engages in such a total community effort without starting from an internal frame of reference. The effort cannot hope to succeed unless the need for internal change among community college staff members—and especially among the teaching faculty—is recognized and acted upon. To whatever extent such an effort does not include concentrated attempts to create changes in the attitudes—and thus the actions—of the teaching faculty, it will have missed the basic point of career education as a refocusing of American education. If this happens, the best that can be hoped for will be creation of a series of new specialists, new courses, and new services within the community college—and that is the "add-on" approach, not true career education. At worst, unless careful thinking is devoted to the topic, a so-called "community education/work council" might try to operate as though the community college itself will remain "as is"—and that would surely be disastrous. I see no good way the full potential of the community college for playing a leadership role in establishing and coordinating the work of a "community education/work council" can be realized unless and until the community college commits itself to the kinds of internal changes called for by the career education concept.

Second, for community colleges to play a leadership role here, the past and present contributions of the K-12 system of public education must be recognized and used, not ignored nor replaced. Of the approximately 9,300 K-12 public school districts that have, to date, initiated some kind of career education effort, there may be as many as 1,000-2,000 who have already established some kind of "community career education action council." Such entities, where they exist, have typically already begun some systematic efforts to identify, catalogue, and utilize resources in the business/labor/industry/professional community for career education. If a community college operates in a community where the K-12 system has initiated this kind of action, it seems to me both appropriate and desirable to try to join forces—not compete with—such

an effort. Any community college can make substantial contributions to helping such K-12 school systems improve their initial data bank and operational relationships with the broader community. Whether or not the K-12 school system has initiated such an effort, it seems especially obvious to me that any such efforts on the part of any community college must be planned in ways that include, rather than exclude, the K-12 public school system.

Third, any community college considering an expansion of collaborative relationships with the broader community in the arena of education/work efforts must, it seems to me, recognize the need to include the many important community segments who, for years, have wrestled with these problems on their own. I am referring here to such efforts as those of local service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, etc.), local chapters of Scouting, USA, Girl Scouts of the USA, Junior Achievement, Chamber of Commerce, The National Alliance of Businessmen, Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Women's American ORT, local Council of Churches, local AFL/CIO affiliates, local NOW chapters, the American Legion and Legion Auxiliary. Most of these efforts have concentrated on younger students and have not considered devoting similar amounts of energy to the community college setting. For some, it would be admittedly inappropriate to do so. That is not the point. Rather, the point is that each represents an existing community resource both interested in and holding high potential for making positive contributions to the total career education effort. Many of their efforts could be, and should be, put in a career development perspective that recognizes the need for extending services and concerns to at least the younger students in the community college. It is a set of resources that should be fully utilized.

Finally, any such effort must recognize the broader community as a learning laboratory for community college students—just as the community college has viewed itself as a learning opportunity for all segments of the community. The "information rich/experience poor" charges that have been leveled against American education are not entirely without validity. The concept of experiential learning has yet to be converted from a series of course opportunities for a minority of students to an educational methodology available to all. The hard questions of who will determine, supervise, grade, and "credit" experiential learning in the broader community are ones that will, hopefully, be answered with the help of "community education/work councils." The necessity for recognizing this as a major direction for change cannot be ignored in any such effort.

Basic Elements of Career Education in Community College Settings

For all of the reasons discussed earlier—plus more—it seems likely to me that career education efforts in community colleges may well vary considerably from those at the K-12 levels. The earlier K-12 experience, on the other hand, can and should be utilized in thinking about dangers to be avoided in initiating career education in community colleges. As a final part of this presentation, then, I

would like to outline what, at this point in time, I consider to be basic elements of career education in a community college setting. I do so with the obvious note of caution that these elements will have to be applied in different fashions—depending on the characteristics of the community college, its students, and the community in which it operates.

First, and most important, a community college career education effort must, it seems to me, start with a full and careful consideration of community college educational goals. The goal of "education as preparation for work" must be considered as one among several basic goals of the community college. It should not be allowed to take precedence over other basic goals. Rather, it should be recognized as one among several to which the community college is committed.

Second, with respect to the goal of "education as preparation for work," career education asks for an expansion in meaning of that goal beyond the conventional interpretation as "specific vocational skill training required for entry into the occupational society." In addition to this interpretation, this goal must take on two other important meanings. One concerns itself with helping students acquire adaptability skills (including work habits, work values, decision-making skills, etc.) required for changing with change in the occupational society. The second concerns itself with expanding the meaning of this goal so as to include unpaid work as well as paid employment—including both productive use of leisure time and the changing meaning of "work" in today's home/family structure. The community college engaged in true career education will accept and find ways of implementing this expanded meaning of the goal of "education as preparation for work."

Third, the community college's career education efforts will expand greatly the means utilized for helping students in the career awareness, exploration, planning and decision-making process. In too many community colleges, these functions are today seen as the prime responsibility of student personnel workers. This, I feel, must change in several ways. One way can easily be seen if we consider current priorities for use of occupational education facilities. Too often, these are reserved—either by law, policy, custom, or tradition—primarily for use by those preparing for specific job entry in a particular area of occupational education. Career education calls for such facilities to be made equally available to the liberal arts student who wants to acquire only enough skill in a particular area so that skill can be used in productive use of leisure time. They should also be made available to the occupationally undecided student who wants some "hands on" exposure to several areas of occupational education before making firm career decisions. In my "ideal" career education program, students will receive academic credit for such experiences.

A second expansion will be seen in greatly increased faculty participation in the career guidance process. I see no way of fully implementing career education unless the teaching faculty are regarded as key participants. Each can and should know the career implications of his/her specialty—in terms of both paid and unpaid work—and be prepared to discuss them with students. Obviously, this will require both (a) inservice staff development for the teaching faculty and (b)

specific assigned time for faculty members to participate in these kinds of interactions with students.

A third area of expansion in this area will be involvement of persons from the business/labor/industry/professional community in the career guidance process. Whether involved in small group seminars, as resource persons in classrooms, or as members of a counseling team in the student personnel offices, such persons can and should be utilized in the career guidance process.

Fourth, a community college career education effort should, it seems to me, involve some form of work experience opportunity for all students. I am, of course, here thinking primarily about the younger students who come to the community college directly from high school. Those enrolled in such liberal arts programs as pre-law, pre-medicine, pre-engineering, etc. are as deserving of work experience opportunities as are those enrolled in pure occupational education programs. Whether that work experience is paid or unpaid will depend on the total set of reasons why it is undertaken—i.e., to the extent productivity for an employer is involved, then pay should also be involved but, to the extent the primary goal is career exploration, unpaid work experience may be justified. This is a good example of an area where implementation should be done only with the full participation of organized labor in basic policy determinations.

Fifth, a community college career education effort should, it seems to me, be built and operated within the framework of career development as a lifelong process. If this is done, then that effort will surely be intimately tied to career education efforts at the K-12 level. It will also be tied to adult/recurrent/continuing education efforts and with career education efforts at the four-year college/university level. A community college that has not considered and established such linkages cannot, in my opinion, be considered to be operating a comprehensive career education effort.

As part of this linkage effort with other segments of education, it seems particularly crucial that the generic problem of stereotyping, as a deterrent to full freedom of occupational choice, be considered and acted upon. This includes problems of race and sex stereotyping as well as stereotyping with respect to handicapped persons and to older Americans. For example, it is difficult to believe that a Title IX Coordinator in a community college would have no interest or involvement in efforts of local elementary schools to reduce sex stereotyping in textbooks and in classroom practices—for it is at these early ages where neglect is most damaging and help is most rewarding.

Finally, it seems to me that, if a community college is engaged in a comprehensive career education effort, the liberal arts faculty will be deeply involved in providing students with knowledge and experience required for actions the student will take to humanize his/her total lifestyle. There is much talk today about dehumanizing conditions in the world of paid employment—and, to be sure, such conditions do exist. At the same time, the individual does have some control over the extent to which such conditions will be personally dehumanizing. If the liberal arts are the "liberating" arts, then they should make

a conscious attempt to help individuals find a personal meaning and meaningfulness in life that will allow them to cope successfully with many of the dehumanizing conditions they are likely to find in the world of paid employment. I would consider such attempts an integral part of the total career education effort.

Concluding Remarks

In my opinion, career education is much needed on the campus of every community college. Perhaps you can see, from these remarks, why I feel there is still much to be done before this becomes a reality. I very much hope that some will be inclined to devote their energies into making career education—comprehensive career education—a reality on the community college campus.

REFERENCES

Levitan, Sar A. & R. Taggart. *The Promise of Greatness: The Social Programs of the Last Decade and Their Major Achievements.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Hoyt, K. "What The Future Holds for the Meaning of Work." *American Vocational Journal,* 1973, *48*, No. 1, 34-37.

Hoyt, K. *Career Education: Contributions to an Evolving Concept.* Salt Lake City: Olympus Publishing Company, 1975.

Super, D. *Career Education and the Meanings of Work.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, GPO Stock No. 017-080-0155-4, 1976.

An Introduction to Career Education: A Policy Paper of the U.S. Office of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1975.

Bartlett, J. *The Shorter Bartlett's Familiar Quotations.* New York: Pocket Press, 1969.

GPO 918-329